

PATENT

REMARKS

The Office Action dated August 23, 2005 has been received and carefully considered. In this response, claims 46 and 48 have been amended to improve their consistency with claim 1 and claims 5 and 7 have been amended to correct antecedent informalities. Claims 20, 22 and 23 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. The amendments to the claims do not narrow the scope of the claims and support for the amendments may be found in the specification and drawings as originally filed. Reconsideration of the outstanding rejections in the present application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

Corrected Declaration

A corrected Declaration is submitted herewith. Withdrawal of the objection to the Declaration therefore is respectfully requested.

Allowability of Claims 37-45, 57 and 58

The Applicants note with appreciation the indication at page 21 of the Office Action that claims 37-45 are allowed and that claims 57 and 58 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitation of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Applicants have opted to forgo rewriting claims 57 and 58 as proposed in view of the following remarks.

Obviousness Rejections of Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 11-17, 20, 22, 23, 25-36, 46-52, 55, 56, 59-62 and 65-69

At page 5 of the Office Action, claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 11, 20, 22, 23, 25, 30-36, 46, 47, 55, and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saha (U.S. Patent No. 6,404,817) and Matsunoshita (U.S. Patent No. 5,835,691). At page 8 of the Office Action, claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saha and Matsunoshita, in view of Paik (U.S. Patent No. 5,216,503). At page 9 of the Office Action, claims 12-14, 17, 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saha, Matsunoshita and Paik in view of IBM-TDB (IBM TDB-ACC-NO: NN9405527). At page 11 of the Office Action, claims 15, 16, 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being

PATENT

unpatentable over Saha, Matsunoshita, Paik and IBM-TDB in view of Lamport (U.S. Patent No. 5,138,615). At page 12 of the Office Action, claims 48-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saha and Matsunoshita in view of Lamport. At page 14 of the Office Action, claims 59, 62, 65, and 66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saha and Matsunoshita in view of Matsuoka (U.S. Patent No. 4,599,608) and Shirley (U.S. Patent No. 5,657,277). At page 17 of the Office Action, claims 60, 67 and 69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saha, Matsunoshita, Matsuoka and Shirley in view of Paik. At page 18 of the Office Action, claim 61 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saha, Matsunoshita, Matsuoka, Shirley and Paik and further in view of Elkind (U.S. Patent No. 5,832,003). At page 20 of the Office Action, claim 68 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saha, Matsunoshita, Matsuoka and Shirley and further in view of IBM-TBD. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The proposed combination of Saha and Matsunoshita fails to disclose or suggest the features of determining if at least one of an underflow error or an overflow error of transformed error correction data has occurred as recited by claims 1, 46 and 59

Claim 1 recites the features of determining if at least one of an underflow error or an overflow error of transformed error correction data has occurred. Claims 46 and 59, which have been amended to so as to be more consistent with the scope of claim 1, recite similar features. The Office Action asserts that Saha discloses determining if an error of transformed error correction data has occurred, but acknowledges that Saha fails to disclose that the error is an underflow error or an overflow error of the transformed error correction data. *Office Action*, p. 5. The Office Action attempts to compensate for this deficiency in the disclosure of Saha by asserting that elements 208 and 209 of Figures 2 and 5 of Matsunoshita and the passages of Matsunoshita at col. 12, lines 32-36 and col. 17, lines 11-16 disclose these features. *Id.*, p. 6. For ease of reference, the relied-upon passages of Matsunoshita are reproduced in their entirety: "For this reason, the OF/UF detection section 208 monitors write and read addresses. When an image is input, if the write address passes the read address that should be incremented in the rear, the OF/UF detection section 208 detects an overflow," *Matsunoshita*, col. 12, lines 32-36; "Next, the operation of the image processing section 20 according to the second embodiments will be discussed. At the image input time, information as to whether or not an overflow

PATENT

occurred while 1-page image data was being input for each page is stored in the overflow information storage memory 209.” *Matsumoshita*, col. 17, lines 11-16.

As the above-cited passages illustrate, *Matsumoshita* discloses that element 208 monitors the code buffer 204 to detect an overflow resulting from the input of an image. *See also Id.*, col. 11, line 63 to col. 12, line 32. In contrast, claim 1 recites determining if an underflow error or an overflow error of transformed error correction data has occurred. As *Matsumoshita* discloses that it is coded data representative of an image (*see Matsumoshita*, Abstract), rather than just transformed error correction data, that is stored in the code buffer 204, one of ordinary skill in the art will appreciate that the overflow condition of coded data for an image of *Matsumoshita* is not the same, or even equivalent to, an underflow error or overflow error of transformed error correction data as recited by claims 1, 46 and 59. Thus, *Matsumoshita* fails to disclose or suggest, alone or in combination with *Saha*, the claimed features of determining if at least one of an underflow error or an overflow error of transformed error correction data has occurred. The proposed combination of *Saha* and *Matsumoshita* therefore fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature recited by claims 1, 46 and 59.

There is no motivation to combine the teachings of Saha and Matsumoshita to arrive at the combination of features recited by claims 1, 46 and 59

The Office Action asserts that one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to combine the teachings of *Saha* and *Matsumoshita* as they allegedly “have aspects from the same field of endeavor of video coding/decoding” and specifically “to be able to detect such common error conditions in order to carry out corrective measures, as *Matsumoshita* indicated in column 13, lines 35-50 and column 15, lines 29-46.” *Office Action*, p. 6.

Contrary to the assertions of the Office Action, there is no motivation to combine the teachings of *Saha* and *Matsumoshita* in the teachings themselves or in the general knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art. As illustrated by the passages of *Saha* at col. 3, lines 3-10, col. 10, lines 21-23, col. 10, line 41 – col. 11, line 30, and col. 11, lines 31-43 cited by the Office Action, *Saha* describes a particular set of errors, all of which relate to errors in the image data itself, rather than errors in components used to process the image data, as would be the case with an underflow error or an overflow error. *Saha* does not discuss the potential for underflow or

PATENT

overflow in any manner. Moreover, as illustrated by the lack of an output connecting the frame store 204 to an input of any of the error handler circuits 418, 426, and 428, Saha does not contemplate monitoring the frame store 204 (used to store the output data) in any manner, much less for the purposes of detecting an underflow error or overflow error. Similarly, as discussed above, Matsunoshita discloses a technique for monitoring the code buffer 204 so as to detect an underflow or an overflow of the code buffer resulting from the storage of coded image data, but Matsunoshita fails to discuss transformed error correction data in any manner, much less determining if underflow errors or overflow errors of transformed error correction data have occurred in any manner. Thus, as Saha fails to provide any suggestion that the underflow/overflow detection technique of Matsunoshita would be desirable, and as Matsunoshita fails to disclose or suggest the image data error detection technique of Saha would be desirable, one of ordinary skill in the art would find no suggestion in the teachings of either Saha or Matsunoshita to combine their teachings. Thus, the combination of Saha and Matsunoshita as proposed by the Office Action is merely a hindsight reconstruction motivated solely by the teachings of the present application.

The proposed combinations of the cited references fail to disclose or suggest the additional features recited by claims 2, 5, 7, 8, 11-17, 20, 22, 23, 35, 36, 47-52, 55-58, 60-62 and 65-69 by virtue of their dependency from one of claims 1, 46 or 59

Claims 2, 5, 7, 8, 11-17, 35 and 36 depend from claim 1. Claims 47-52 and 55-58 depend from claim 46. Claims 60-62 and 65-69 depend from claim 59. The Office Action does not assert that Paik, IBM-TDB, Lamport, Matsuoka, Shirley or Elkind disclose or suggest, individually or in combination, the features of claims 1, 46 and 59 that are not disclosed or suggested by the proposed combination of Saha and Matsunoshita, nor in fact are these features disclosed or suggested by these references. Accordingly, the proposed combinations of Saha, Matsunoshita, Paik, IBM-TDB, Lamport, Matsuoka, Shirley and Elkind fail to disclose or suggest the additional features of claims 2, 5, 7, 8, 11-17, 35, 36, 47-52, 55-58, 60-62 and 65-69 at least by virtue of their dependency from one of claims 1, 46 or 59. Moreover, these claims recite additional, non-obvious features.

PATENT

The Office Action fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness for rejecting claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 11-17, 25-36, 46-52, 55, 56, 59-62 and 65-69

As described above, the proposed combinations of the cited references fail to disclose or suggest the particular combinations of features recited by claims 1, 46 and 59 and their dependent claims. The Office Action therefore fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness in rejecting claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 11-17, 25-36, 46-52, 55, 56, 59-62 and 65-69. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejections is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

The Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-0441.

Respectfully submitted,

21 October 2005
Date



Ryan S. Davidson, Reg. No. 51,596
TOLER, LARSON & ABEL, L.L.P.
5000 Plaza On The Lake, Suite 265
Austin, Texas 78746
(512) 327-5515 (phone)
(512) 327-5452 (fax)